

Advisory Action

In response to the Amendment filed on December 3, 2002, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action dated December 26, 2002. In the Advisory Action "Note", the Examiner indicated that the Proposed Amendment addresses the rejection based upon the asserted Applicants' admitted prior art (APA), beginning on page 3 of the Final Rejection, but that it fails to overcome rejections based upon APA in view of Oyama et al., beginning on page 4 of the Final Rejection.

In the portion cited by the Examiner in the "Note" claims 1-5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the Prior Art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,808,708 to Oyama et al. (Oyama). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserts that APA (assuming it is APA) discloses a back light unit in Figures 1 and 2 (page 1, line 14 through page 4, line 5), in a liquid crystal display, comprising: a light input, 20, for leading a light path of a light beam to the rear side thereof to obtain focusing of the light beam. The Examiner admits that APA does not explicitly disclose a high degree of focusing, and relies on Oyama to fill this vacancy.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has conceded that Applicants' Proposed Amendment addresses the rejection based upon APA, which is the primary reference applied in conjunction with Oyama. While the

Examiner admits that APA is overcome, the Examiner has not asserted that Oyama fills the vacancy.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner makes identical assertions in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) over APA in paragraph 5 of the Office Action and in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) over APA in view of Oyama in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. Applicants submit that if APA is overcome standing alone, it is also overcome when applied in combination with a secondary reference (in this case, Oyama). Nevertheless, Applicants submit that Oyama does not fill the vacancy of APA.

In the Amendment filed on December 3, 2002, Applicants submitted that APA fails to disclose or suggest a light input for directing a light path of a light beam *substantially* to the rear side thereof and away from the light guide prior to directing said light path to a front side thereof and toward the light guide (as recited in claim 1, as amended).

By not allowing the application, and refusing entry of the Amendment, it is apparent that the Examiner takes the position that Oyama fills this vacancy. Applicants submit that there are yet more distinctions between Applicants' claimed back light unit and Oyama. For example, Oyama discloses a light guide plate (4), the ends thereof forming semicircles (see Oyama, Fig. 2, and Col. 5, lines 62-63). Light guide 4 has bent end portion 4b, referred to as the non-corresponding section (see Oyama, Col. 6, lines 2-5). This portion of light

guide 4 has a light incidence end 4C at the same level as, and receiving light directly and instantaneously from light source 3 (see Oyama, Figs. 1-6 etc).

Clearly light incidence end 4c is a part of the light guide 4 and is at the same level as light source 4. Therefore, while the device of Oyama may direct some light to the rear, Oyama does not disclose or suggest wherein all portions of the light guide are installed at a height different from a height of the light input, as recited in independent claim 1, as amended in the Response filed on December 3, 2002.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend on claim 1. Since Oyama, like the prior art, fails to disclose or suggest wherein all portions of the light guide are installed at a height different from a height of the light input, the prior art in view of Oyama cannot render claims 1-5 and 7 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Prior Art, in view of Oyama, as applied to claim 2, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,808,713 to Broer et al.

Oyama and the Prior Art, argued above with respect to independent claim 1, fails to disclose or suggest wherein all portions of the light guide are installed at a height different from a height of the light input, as recited in independent claim 1. Broer, directed to a reflective polarizer, cannot fill this vacancy.

Claims 8, 11, 13, 14 (and claim 2) depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Since neither the Prior Art, nor Oyama, nor Broer, discloses or suggests the above-recited features of independent claim 1, the Prior Art, in view of Oyama, as applied to claim 2, and further in view of Broer, cannot render claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 6, 9, 10, 12 and 17 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the

outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 
Joseph A. Kolasch
Reg. No.: 22,463


JAK/PLS:asc

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703) 205-8000